



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/731,325	12/05/2003	Subhash Chopra	FHW-130	5071
27572	7590	04/03/2008		
HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.				
P.O. BOX 828				
BLOOMFIELD HILLS, MI 48303				
EXAMINER				
ENGLAND, DAVID E				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2143				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
04/03/2008		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/731,325

Applicant(s)

CHOPRA ET AL.

Examiner

DAVID E. ENGLAND

Art Unit

2143

Period for Reply -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11 January 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 2, 6, 7 and 11-21 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 2, 6, 7 and 11-21 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/S508)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1, 2, 6, 7 and 11 – 21 are presented for examination.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. **Claims 1, 6, 11, 13 – 16 and 18 – 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Estberg et al. U.S. Patent No. 6148337, (hereinafter Estberg) in view of Shah et al. (6678835), (hereinafter Shah).**

4. As per claim 1, as closely interpreted by the Examiner, Estberg teaches data acquisition, storage and delivery apparatus, comprising a networked computing means on which is provided:
5. an acquisition agent with access to usage data from a plurality of different communications resources, (e.g., col. 12, line 66 – col. 13, line 29, “*Poller 226, Status Manager 225*”);
6. a storage agent arranged to store communications usage data from the said plurality of communications resources, (e.g., col. 13, line 30 – col. 14, line 16, “*RTR, Poller and Status Manager*”); and

7. a delivery agent arranged to deliver communications usage data to a subscribing management system, (e.g., col. 13, line 30 – col. 14, line 16, “*RTR, Poller and Status Manager*”), wherein said usage data is delivered immediately over a communication link to said subscribing management system when said communication link is available, (e.g., col. 13, line 30 – col. 14, line 16, “*RTR, Poller and Status Manager*”), but does not specifically teach said usage data is retained when said communication link fails.

8. Shah teaches wherein the usage data is retained when the communications link fails, (e.g., col. 22, line 40 – col. 23, line 17). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Shah with Estberg because monitoring links in a system for failures allows the system to quickly attend to the failures and resolve them by utilizing backup links. This also allows the system to have smaller amounts of delays in transmitting information because of the backing up of links when one is down.

9. Claims 11, 13 – 16 and 18 – 21 are rejected for similar reasons stated above.

10. Claims 2, 7, 12 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Estberg and Shah as applied to the independent claims above and in view of Miloslavsky et al. (6981020), (hereinafter Miloslavsky) in further view of Cravo De Almeida et al. (2003/0055931), (hereinafter Cravo).

11. As per claim 2, as closely interpreted by the Examiner, Estberg teaches the communications resources are selected from a group in a telephone service provider's public network, (e.g., col. 4, lines 11 – 37), which is well known in the art to.

12. Examiner takes Official Notice (see MPEP § 2144.03) that "monitoring devices commonly found in a network and/or on the Internet from a group of have IP telephony systems, email servers, proxy servers, firewalls, switches, routers, web servers " in a computer networking environment was well known in the art at the time the invention was made. The Applicant is entitled to traverse any/all official notice taken in this action according to MPEP § 2144.03, namely, "if applicant traverses such an assertion, the examiner should cite a reference in support of his or her position". However, MPEP § 2144.03 further states "See also In re Boon, 439 F.2d 724, 169 USPQ 231 (CCPA 1971) (a challenge to the taking of judicial notice must contain adequate information or argument to create on its face a reasonable doubt regarding the circumstances justifying the judicial notice)." Specifically, In re Boon, 169 USPQ 231, 234 states "as we held in Ahlert, an applicant must be given the opportunity to challenge either the correctness of the fact asserted or the notoriety or repute of the reference cited in support of the assertion. We did not mean to imply by this statement that a bald challenge, with nothing more, would be all that was needed". Further note that 37 CFR § 1.671(c)(3) states "Judicial notice means official notice". Thus, a traversal by the Applicant that is merely "a bald challenge, with nothing more" will be given very little weight.

13. Estberg does not explicitly stated PBX telephone systems and mobile telephony.

14. Miloslavsky teaches the resources being PBX telephone systems, (e.g., col. 5, line 55 – col. 6, line 10). Cravo teaches monitoring mobile telephony networks, (e.g., ¶ 0036). It would

have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Miloslavsky and Cravo with Estberg and Shah because monitoring a plurality of commonly found attributes in a network or the Internet would allow the users that have access to the monitored status of all different protocols or resources found on most networks and/or the Internet.

15. Claim 7, 12 and 17 are rejected for similar reasons as stated above.

Response to Arguments

16. Applicant's arguments filed 01/11/2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

17. In the Remarks, Applicant argues in substance that Estberg and Shah do not teach the claims as stated above. More specifically, Estberg does not teach the amended section of the claims and Shah does not teach communication links.

18. As to the Remark, Examiner does not use Estberg for the rejection of the limitation Applicant amended into the independent claims, i.e., claim 5's limitation was amended into the dependent claims. Examiner uses Shah to teach the limitation of the usage data is retained when the communications link fails. Shah teaches a communication link failure in the cited area applied above. As stated in Shah, the usage data, which is not defined by the Applicant as to what this could be and therefore has a very broad interpretation, is continually updated within the system and when a communication link or process fails on a server, the forwarding server stores

the usage data and continually calls the server until it re-connects i.e., a "Keep Alive" signal, see cited areas stated above and column 22, lines 54 et seq.

Conclusion

19. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to DAVID E. ENGLAND whose telephone number is (571)272-3912. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Thur, 7:00-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nathan J. Flynn can be reached on 571-272-1915. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

David E. England
Examiner
Art Unit 2143

/D. E. E./
Examiner, Art Unit 2143

/Nathan J. Flynn/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2154